arXiv:quant-ph/9706043v1 18 Jun 1997

Quantum phenomena do not violate the principle of locality

- a new interpretation with physical consequences -

Gyula Bene
Institute for Solid State Physics, Eötvös University
Múzeum krt. 6-8, H-1088 Budapest, Hungary

February 1, 2008

Abstract

A new interpretation of nonrelativistic quantum mechanics explains the violation of Bell's inequality by maintaining realism and the principle of locality.

1 Introduction

A great majority of physicists seems to believe in telepathy[1] (cf. [2]). Is it a joke? No. They really do because they think they have a compelling argument. It is the experimentally proven violation of Bell's inequality. This inequality, discovered by John Bell in 1964 [3], refers to correlations between measurements performed on two separated quantum objects, say, on two spin-half particles. Note that the actual measurements have been performed on optical photons[4], [5], [6], [7] and also on gamma-photons [8] and protons [9]. These particles were previously bound together in a singlet state, and became separated in a decay process prior to the measurement. After such antecedents it is not surprising at all that the results of spin measurements done on the two separated particles exhibit correlations. E.g., as the net spin is zero, if spin is measured on both particles in the same direction,

there is a strict anticorrelation. One expects that the correlations are due to the common past of the particles. This idea seems to have quantitative consequences. [10]

Suppose the spin component $\vec{S}\cdot\vec{a}$ has been measured on particle 1 and the spin component $\vec{S}\cdot\vec{b}$ has been measured on particle 2. Here $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$ are unit vectors. The shorthand notation $\vec{a}+$ (or $\vec{a}-$) will mean that the spin component $\vec{S}\cdot\vec{a}$ has been measured with the result $a=+1$ (or $a=-1$) (in $\hbar/2$ units). We shall also write simply a for the situation when the spin component $\vec{S}\cdot\vec{a}$ has been measured and the result of the measurement is a ($=+1$ or -1). Now we assume that at each measurement there exist some stable property λ, characterising the previous bound state of the particles, that determines (at least in a probabilistic sense) the outcome of the measurements. In other terms, λ represents the common past of the particles. Now we assume that

(*) *there exists a joint probability distribution $P(a,b,\lambda)$ for the possible outcomes of the measurements and the property λ.*

Taking into account that the particles became separated before the measurement, the principle of locality implies that $P(a,b,\lambda)$ is of the product form

$$P(a,b,\lambda)=P_1(a,\lambda)P_2(b,\lambda)\rho(\lambda)\ , \tag{1}$$

where e.g. $P_1(a,\lambda)$ means the conditional probability that the first spin measurement along the direction $\vec{a}$ gives the result a if the quantity characterizing the common past was λ.

Integrating over the quantity λ, we get for the correlation between the measurements

$$P(a,b)=\int P_1(a,\lambda)P_2(b,\lambda)\rho(\lambda)d\lambda\ . \tag{2}$$

As there is a strict anticorrelation for $\vec{b}=\vec{a}$, one must have $P(\vec{a}+,\vec{a}+)=0$. This implies that for almost all λ where $\rho(\lambda)\neq 0$ either $P_1(\vec{a}+|\lambda)=0$ or $P_2(\vec{a}+|\lambda)=0$. We also have $P(\vec{a}-,\vec{a}-)=0$ which implies either $P_1(\vec{a}+|\lambda)=1-P_1(\vec{a}-|\lambda)=1$ or $P_2(\vec{a}+|\lambda)=1-P_2(\vec{a}-|\lambda)=1$. As we see, $P_1(\vec{a}+|\lambda)$ and $P_2(\vec{a}+|\lambda)$ can take on only the values 0 and 1, and

$$P_1(\vec{a}+|\lambda)+P_2(\vec{a}+|\lambda)=1\ . \tag{3}$$

Bell's inequality follows now as

$$
\begin{aligned}
P(\vec{a}+,\vec{b}+)+P(\vec{b}+,\vec{c}+) &= \int d\lambda\rho(\lambda)\left[P_1(\vec{a}+|\lambda)P_2(\vec{b}+|\lambda)+P_1(\vec{b}+|\lambda)P_2(\vec{c}+|\lambda)\right] \\
&\geq \int d\lambda\rho(\lambda)\left[P_1(\vec{a}+|\lambda)P_2(\vec{b}+|\lambda)P_2(\vec{c}+|\lambda)+P_1(\vec{b}+|\lambda)P_2(\vec{c}+|\lambda)P_1(\vec{a}+|\lambda)\right] \qquad (4) \\
&= \int d\lambda\rho(\lambda)P_1(\vec{a}+|\lambda)P_2(\vec{c}+|\lambda)\left[P_2(\vec{b}+|\lambda)+P_1(\vec{b}+|\lambda)\right] \\
&= \int d\lambda\rho(\lambda)P_1(\vec{a}+|\lambda)P_2(\vec{c}+|\lambda) = P(\vec{a}+,\vec{c}+)\ ,
\end{aligned}
$$

where Eq.(3) has been used to get the last line[12]. Bell's inequality expresses the quantitative consequences of the idea that the correlations stem from the common past of the particles, provided that the principle of locality and the additional, natural-looking assumption (*) is true. The whole argument is so simple and looks so convincing, that one might think that Eq.(4) should actually hold. Nevertheless, calculating the correlation quantum mechanically, the resulting expression,

$$
P(\vec{a}+,\vec{b}+) = \frac{1}{2}\sin^2\left(\frac{\theta_{a,b}}{2}\right) \qquad (5)
$$

(where $\theta_{a,b}$ stands for the angle between the directions $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$) does not satisfy Eq.(4) for certain angles. Indeed, chosing e.g. $\theta_{a,b}=45^o$, $\theta_{b,c}=45^o$ and $\theta_{a,c}=90^o$ (i.e., all the three spin directions lie in the same plane), we get $P(\vec{a}+,\vec{b}+)=\frac{1}{4}-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{8}$, $P(\vec{b}+,\vec{c}+)=\frac{1}{4}-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{8}$, $P(\vec{a}+,\vec{c}+)=\frac{1}{2}$, in clear contradiction with Eq.(4).

The question is now what is correct in the reality: the quantum mechanical prediction or Bell's inequality. In actual measurements strict anticorrelation is hard to realize, therefore, a generalized form of Bell's inequality [11] has been tested. The result of most experiments[4], [5], [6], [7] (and still many others) violated (the generalized) Bell's inequality and was consistent with quantum mechanics.

In case of photons the experiments of Alain Aspect et al.[5], [6] (cf. the recent Ref. [7]) have particularly clearly demonstrated that the quantum mechanical prediction is correct, and Bell's inequality is indeed violated in Nature[13].

As we have to accept that Eq.(4) fails, at least one of the previous assumptions must be wrong. The usual conclusion[14] is that it is probably

the principle of locality which fails, i.e., separated particles can somehow influence each other, although there is no known physical interaction between them. Note that this influence (if exists) should be faster than light, as the two measurements can take place outside of each others light cone[6].

This conclusion questions the validity of a basic physical principle which is well established in all the branches of physics. Even the equations of the most sophisticated quantum field theories respect the principle of locality. Once it is satisfied by any other physical processes, why would quantum measurement be the only exception? Also, it is of worth recalling that there is no direct experimental proof for the existence of an action-at-a-distance. Indeed, suppose that one prepares the initial two-particle state several times and performs measurements on the first particle. The statistics of the results will be the same, whatever happens with the second particle. It does not matter, whether we also do some measurement on the second particle, provided we analyze only the data of the first measurement. So the conclusion about the failure of the principle of locality stems exclusively from the investigation of *correlations* between the measurements done on the first and the second particle. Here, however, we also make the additional assumption (*) which may be in error.

Why not give up then assumption (*)? Certainly, then Bell's inequality does not follow and we do not have to give up the principle of locality. However, it is a widely spread belief that (*) is implied by realism, i.e. by the principle that the properties (in our case a, b and λ) exist independently of our mind. Therefore, giving up (*) would imply that we give up realism, that is even less acceptable than giving up locality.

In this paper we are going to review and discuss such a theory[15] where (*) is not implied by realism. In order to show that there is such a logical possibility, it is instructive to express realism in the form that the properties a, b, λ are *elements of the reality*. Any reasonable definition of the joint probability $P(a, b, \lambda)$ requires that the properties a, b, λ be also comparable, so they must exist together, and the probability is assigned to the *set* $\{a, b, \lambda\}$. Therefore, the existence of $P(a, b, \lambda)$ requires that the set $\{a, b, \lambda\}$, too, be an *element* of the reality. Nevertheless, realism (as expressed above) implies only that the set $\{a, b, \lambda\}$ is a *subset* of the reality, so there is no logical necessity that realism would imply assumption (*). In the theory presented below we shall see that the properties a, b, λ can be identified with certain quantum states. Each of them can be determined by a suitable measurement

with probability 1, without disturbing it. This is the natural expression of realism within the theory. Nevertheless, all the three states cannot be measured simultaneously, as the measurement of the state playing the role of λ will change the correlation $P(a, b)$ between the other two states. Hence we cannot compare the three states with each other so that $P(a, b)$ is unchanged. Correspondingly, there is no way to define $P(a, b, \lambda)$, while the theory fulfills the requirements of realism and satisfies the principle of locality.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2. we review the new interpretation[15] in a pedagogical style, discuss the meaning of the new postulates and apply the scheme to an idealized quantum measurement. In Section 3. the EPR-Bell experiment is considered. It is shown that the source of the correlations is exclusively the common past of the particles, hence there is no action-at-a-distance. It is also pointed out, that the state representing the common past cannot be determined simultaneously with those corresponding to the measurement results, so $P(a, b, \lambda)$ does not exist. The concluding Section 4. summarizes the main results of the paper and comments briefly the relation and new achievements of the theory discussed here, compared to previous interpretations.

2 The new interpretation

There are several myths about quantum mechanics today. One of them has been mentioned above, this is the alleged nonlocality. Another one is the deep but unfounded conviction that quantum mechanics becomes invalid when applied to macroscopic systems. Unfounded, because there is no experiment which would prove any significant deviation. Owing to the recent remarkable experimental development in quantum optics people put quantum mechanics again and again to the test, and quantum mechanics passes these tests without an exception. Nonetheless, many experts have the opinion that there must be a 'new physics' in the macroscopic regime, i.e., the Schrödinger equation must be modified there and it has measurable effects.

The ideas to be presented here do not want to change quantum mechanics in this way. The present author thinks that according to all the available experimental evidence the Schrödinger equation is valid for any closed system, even if it is macroscopic. But quantum mechanics is not solely the Schrödinger equation. As has been postulated by von Neumann[16], at

measurements allegedly something very strange happens, which cannot be described in terms of the Schrödinger equation. It is the collapse (or reduction) of the wave function. Although for practical purposes this concept is satisfactory, at the same time it is the source of all the difficulties in quantum mechanics. As a matter of fact, if we think seriously that the Schrödinger equation is valid, then it cannot happen that certain distinguished physical systems, the measuring devices, do not obey it. Therefore, the new interpretation does not use the concept of the collapse at all. Instead, a completely new physical assumption is introduced (the fundamental dependence of the states on quantum reference systems, see below), together with a series of new postulates. The resulting new scheme is free from the usual conceptual difficulties[15]: it solves Schrödinger's cat paradox[17] and the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) paradox[18]. As we shall demonstrate in the present paper as well, the new interpretation also explains the violation of Bell's inequality by maintaining both realism and the principle of locality.

For some people a new interpretation is just a 'rewording' of the same physics. They should replace the word 'interpretation' with the word 'theory' everywhere in this paper, as the scheme presented here has a deep physical content. The situation is somewhat analogous to the birth of special relativity: in 1905 the Lorentz transformation was already well known, and people tried to explain it with the special properties of the 'aether'. The discovery of the actual physical content (the fundamental dependence of the lengths and time intervals on the choice of the inertia system[19]) by Einstein did not change the formulas, still it made clear that there is no 'aether' at all, but one has to do with a new physical principle and has to revise his basic concepts about physical reality. Similarly, today people believe in nonlocality and construct theories in order to explain the collapse of the wave function. The present theory (or interpretation) tells us that it is useless, as there is no collapse at all, but we have to do with a new physical principle (the fundamental dependence of the states on quantum reference systems) again and we have to revise our old ideas about quantum mechanics and the meaning of the wave function.

2.1 The main idea

We shall introduce the main idea of the new interpretation step by step, explaining it first on a simple example.

Let us consider an idealized measurement of an $\hat{S}_z$ spin component of some spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particle. Be the particle P initially in the state $\alpha|\uparrow> +\beta|\downarrow>$, where $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ and the states $|\uparrow>$ and $|\downarrow>$ are the eigenstates of $\hat{S}_z$ corresponding to the eigenvalues $\frac{\hbar}{2}$ and $-\frac{\hbar}{2}$, respectively. The dynamics of the measurement is given by the relations $|\uparrow> |m_0> \rightarrow |\uparrow> |m_\uparrow>$ and $|\downarrow> |m_0> \rightarrow |\downarrow> |m_\downarrow>$, where $|m_0>$, $|m_\uparrow>$ and $|m_\downarrow>$ stand for states of the measuring device M and the arrow $\rightarrow$ symbolizes the unitary time evolution. The linearity of the Schrödinger equation implies that the measurement process can be written as

$$(\alpha|\uparrow> +\beta|\downarrow>)|m_0> \rightarrow |\Psi>= \alpha|\uparrow> |m_\uparrow> +\beta|\downarrow> |m_\downarrow> \quad . \tag{6}$$

Let us consider now the state of the measuring device M after the measurement. As the combined system $P+M$ is in an entangled state, the measuring device has no own wave function and may be described by the *reduced density matrix*[20]

$$\hat{\rho}_M = Tr_P\left(|\Psi><\Psi|\right) = |m_\uparrow> |\alpha|^2 < m_\uparrow| + |m_\downarrow> |\beta|^2 < m_\downarrow| \quad , \tag{7}$$

where Tr_P stands for the trace operation in the Hilbert space of the particle P. Nevertheless, if we look at the measuring device, we certainly see that either $\frac{\hbar}{2}$ or $-\frac{\hbar}{2}$ spin component has been measured, that correspond to the states $|m_\uparrow>$ and $|m_\downarrow>$, respectively. These are not the same as the state (7), which contains both $|m_\uparrow>$ and $|m_\downarrow>$, not only one of them. At this point it is important to note that the usual 'ignorance interpretation' (which tells that the meaning of Eq. (7) is just that either $|m_\uparrow><m_\uparrow|$ or $|m_\downarrow><m_\downarrow|$ is realized) is incompatible with the assumed universal validity of the Schrödinger equation. Indeed, the 'ignorance interpretation' would imply at once that actually only one term of the superposition (6) exist, i.e., there is a collapse of the wave function. The statement that the density matrix of an individual system must be an objective and irreducible property can also be derived from the requirement of locality [21].

So the quantum prediction does not agree with experience. Why do we get different states? According to orthodox quantum mechanics[22] one may argue as follows. The reduced density matrix $\hat{\rho}_M$ has been calculated from the state $|\Psi>$ (cf. Eq.(6)) of the whole system $P+M$. A state is the result of a measurement (the preparation), so we may describe M by $\hat{\rho}_M$ if we have gained our information about M from a measurement done on $P+M$.

On the other hand, looking at the measuring device directly is equivalent with a measurement done directly on M. In this case M is described by either $|m_\uparrow >$ or $|m_\downarrow >$. We may conclude that performing measurements on different systems (each containing the system we want to decribe) gives rise to different descriptions (in terms of different states). Let us call the system which has been measured (it is $P + M$ in the first case and M in the second case) the *quantum reference system*. Using this terminology, we may tell that we make a measurement on the quantum reference system R, thus we prepare its state $|\psi_R >$ and using this information we calculate the state $\hat{\rho}_S(R) = Tr_{R\setminus S}\left(|\psi_R >< \psi_R|\right)$ of a subsystem S. This means that we have to take the trace over the Hilbert space of the system $R \setminus S$ which is complementer to S in R. We shall call $\hat{\rho}_S(R)$ the state of S with respect to R. Obviously $\hat{\rho}_R(R) = |\psi_R >< \psi_R|$, thus $|\psi_R >$ may be identified with the state of the system R with respect to itself. For brevity we shall call both $\hat{\rho}_R(R)$ and $|\psi_R >$ the internal state of R.

Let us emphasize that up to now, despite of the new terminology, we have not made any new physical assumptions. We have merely considered some rather elementary consequences of basic quantum mechanics.

Mathematically it is evident that the state of the system S (i.e., $\hat{\rho}_S(R)$) depends on the choice of the quantum reference system R. Now we ask again, what is the physics behind it?

In the spirit of the Copenhagen interpretation one would answer that in quantum mechanics measurements unavoidably disturb the systems, therefore, if we perform measurements on different surroundings R, this disturbance is different, and this is reflected in the R-dependence of $\hat{\rho}_S(R)$. Nevertheless, this argument is not compelling.

At this decisive point we leave the traditional framework of quantum mechanics and assume that the states $\hat{\rho}_S(R_1)$, $\hat{\rho}_S(R_2)$... have already existed before the measurements. It means that their difference cannot be attributed to the measurements. Hence the R-dependence of $\hat{\rho}_S(R)$ is a fundamental feature, which cannot be explained. We have to accept it as a basic property of Nature. Let us emphasize that it is a radical departure from traditional quantum mechanics. The states are not conceived as the results of some measurements, instead, they are elements of the reality (more will be said about this below). Therefore, according to the present interpretation the famous saying of J.A.Wheeler ('A quantum phenomenon is a phenomenon only if it is a recorded phenomenon') does not hold true. Concerning the

relation between states and measurements, measurements will be conceived as usual interactions between physical systems and will be explained in terms of the states, not vice versa.

Now we have the picture that a given system S can be characterized at one and the same instant of time by a multitude of states $\hat{\rho}_S(R_1)$, $\hat{\rho}_S(R_2)$..., each referring to a different quantum reference system R_1, R_2, etc. These quantum reference systems themselves are physical systems which contain the system S. We have to explain, what it means that these states are elements of the reality. In the present theory the elements of reality will be defined rather similarly (but not equivalently) to the well-known EPR reality criterion[18]. We shall say that

a state $\hat{\rho}_S(R)$ is an element of the reality if and only if there exist in principle a suitable measurement, which, if performed on the quantum reference system R, does not change this state and determines it with unit probability.

We shall call the above 'suitable measurement' a *nondisturbing measurement*. The term *in principle* means that we do not necessarily know which observable should be measured, but the theory ensures that such exists. We shall see later that if the state of an *isolated* system I[23] is known, and this isolated system contains R, then the appropriate observable is $\hat{\rho}_R(I)$[24]. Therefore, supposing that such an isolated environment always exist, the above reality criterion ensures that all the states $\hat{\rho}_S(R_1)$, $\hat{\rho}_S(R_2)$... are elements of the reality.

The meaning of the quantum reference systems is now analogous to the classical coordinate systems. Choosing a classical coordinate system means that we imagine what we would experience if we were there. Similarly, choosing a quantum reference system R means that we imagine what we would experience if we did a nondisturbing measurement on R that does not disturbe $\hat{\rho}_R(R) = |\psi_R >< \psi_R|$ while we learn it with probability 1. Certainly, at the same time we also get $\hat{\rho}_S(R) = Tr_{R\setminus S}|\psi_R >< \psi_R|$ for any $S \subset R$.

It is important to emphasize a specific new feature of the present approach: the above reality criterion *does not* imply that the states $\hat{\rho}_S(R_1)$, $\hat{\rho}_S(R_2)$... can all be *simultaneously* determined via nondisturbing measurements. The reality criterion only ensures that *any* of them can be determined, but usually only one (it may be freely choosen, which one) at the same time. The reason is very simple: a nondisturbing measurement done on the system R_1 does not change the state $\hat{\rho}_S(R_1)$, but it may change the state $\hat{\rho}_S(R_2)$. Therefore, the fact that both $\hat{\rho}_S(R_1)$ and $\hat{\rho}_S(R_2)$ are elements of the reality

does not imply that they can be compared. It is instructive to express this feature (cf. the similar discussion in the Introduction) by telling that comparability of two states requires that not only the two states, but also the *set* containing these two states be an *element* of reality. The fact that each of the two states is an element of the reality implies only that the set containing the two states is a *subset* of the reality.

So when can two (or more) states be compared? Consider the states $\hat{\rho}_{S_1}(R_1)$, $\hat{\rho}_{S_2}(R_2)$... (which describe different systems if $S_1 \neq S_2$). If the quantum reference systems R_1, R_2 ... are *disjointed* (have no common subsystem) then the nondisturbing measurements performed on R_1, R_2 ... do not disturbe each other, so the states can be compared, or, in other terms, the set containing them is an element of the reality. Actually this is the only situation when states are always comparable without changing them.

2.2 The new postulates

As the dependence of $\hat{\rho}_S(R)$ on R is a fundamental property now, one has to specify the relation of the different states in terms of suitable postulates. Although the motivation will be explained, the actual justification of these postulates must come *a posteriori*, when checking their consistency and measurable consequences.

There will be two kinds of postulates. The first group (**Postulates 2** and **5**) contains those which have direct counterparts in traditional quantum mechanics and therefore will seem mere translations to a new language. The second group (**Postulates 1**, **3** and **4**), however, has no counterpart in traditional quantum mechanics. These postulates render possible to free the theory from the *a priori* classical background which was an essential part of the traditional theory. Note that the present set of postulates is reduced compared to that given in Ref. [15], in order to make the scheme more transparent. The two schemes are completely identical, but in the present paper such rather obvious statements like 'the state $\hat{\rho}_S(R)$ is a hermitian, positive definite operator acting on the Hilbert space of S' have not received the status of a postulate.

Postulate 1. *The internal state $\hat{\rho}_R(R)$ is always a single dyad* $|\Psi_R >< \Psi_R|$.

Therefore, we shall call the state $|\Psi_R >$ an internal state, too.

Postulate 2. $\hat{\rho}_S(R) = Tr_{R\backslash S}|\psi_R >< \psi_R|$

Here we have to add that despite of the different letters R and S, there are no restrictions which physical system is the quantum reference system R and which is the system S to be described, except that $S \subseteq R$.

Postulate 3. *If the reference system $R = I$ is an isolated one [23] then the state $\hat{\rho}_S(I)$ commutes with the internal state $\hat{\rho}_S(S)$.*

This means that the internal state of S coincides with one of the eigenstates of $\hat{\rho}_S(I)$. Knowing only $\hat{\rho}_S(I)$, it cannot be told, with which one. Only the corresponding probabilities can be given (cf. below, **Postulate 5**). Therefore, we shall call the eigenstates of $\hat{\rho}_S(I)$ the possible internal states of S provided that the reference system I is an isolated one. Let us emphasize that the relation between $\hat{\rho}_S(S)$ and $\hat{\rho}_S(I)$ is many-to-one, and this makes possible to incorporate the indeterministic nature of quantum mechanics in the present approach.

A frequent question is what happens if two (or more) nonzero eigenvalues[25] of $\hat{\rho}_S(I)$ coincide. This leads to a problem only if the eigenvalues are exactly equal. Certainly, if the eigenvalues are constant (S does not interact with its environment, which is hardly realizable), this is a nonphysical situation, as two different physical quantities are never exactly equal. If S interacts with its environment, the eigenvalues change and at a given instant of time t_0 they may cross each other. But this happens only at that instant of time, and not during some finite time interval. So the eigenstates are well defined as the function of time t, except at $t = t_0$. Taking the limit $\lim_{t \to t_0}$ of the eigenstates as functions of time, the limiting states may in principle define the eigenstates also at $t = t_0$, although a single instant of time is physically irrelevant. Certainly, if the eigenvalues are close to each other, the eigenstates become rather sensitive with respect to perturbations, but the exact degeneracy (when the eigenstates are truly undetermined) is a nonphysical case.[26]

Another question is whether the definition of $\hat{\rho}_S(I)$ is unique. Suppose I_1 and I_2 are two different isolated systems, both containing S. Be $R = I_1 \cap I_2$. Then, due to the definition of the isolated system, $I_1 \setminus R$ has not yet interacted with I_2. As $I_2 \supseteq R$, it also implies that $I_1 \setminus R$ has not yet interacted with R. Therefore, $|\Psi_{I_1}>$ (the internal state of I_1) is of the product form $|\Psi_R> |\Psi_{I_1 \setminus R}>$. Similarly, $|\Psi_{I_2}>= |\Psi_R> |\Psi_{I_2 \setminus R}>$. Therefore, $\hat{\rho}_S(I_1) = \hat{\rho}_S(I_2) = \hat{\rho}_S(R)$. Actually this uniqueness allows one to relate $\hat{\rho}_S(I)$ and $\hat{\rho}_S(S)$.

Postulate 4. *The result of a measurement is contained unambigously in the internal state of the measuring device.*

This is the only postulate which directly relates the present scheme to the experience. One naturally expects that the state of the measuring device M (as calculated using the rules of the theory) contains the result of the measurement. But in the present theory a given system has a multitude of states, each referring to a different quantum reference system. One has to specify, which of them corresponds to the experience when doing a measurement. According to the present postulate, it is the internal state $\hat{\rho}_M(M)$. If we return to the spin measurement, we find that this postulate (together with **Postulate 3**) implies that the measurement result corresponds either to the state $|m_\uparrow>$ or to the state $|m_\downarrow>$.

One may ask what is then a 'measuring device'. It can be either an observer (a person, you or me)[27], or any system whose internal states can be uniquely related to those of an observer. To be more explicit, suppose that one looks at the measuring device in the spin measurement. The dynamics of this process can be written down schematically as

$$\begin{aligned} |m_\uparrow>|O_0> &\rightarrow |m_\uparrow>|O_\uparrow> \\ |m_\downarrow>|O_0> &\rightarrow |m_\downarrow>|O_\downarrow> \ . \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Here e.g. $|O_\uparrow>$ stands for the state which describes that the observer reads 'spin up' from the measuring device. This *dynamics* is what qualifies the measuring device as being such, i.e., being able to convey information to the observer. Using the postulates (including the last one, see below) we get that the internal state of the measuring device and the observer are uniquely related. (This will be shown in more detail in the next subsection.) This unique relation depends on the special dynamics. If the possible internal states of the measuring device are such that the coordinates and momenta of the pointer are well determined (i.e., they have small standard deviations), this special dynamics is realized to a good approximation. This is actually the classical behavior. It should be emphasized that classical behaviour in the present scheme is not something to be postulated. If the theory is correct, it should come out automatically after having made realistic assumptions concerning the initial states, the structure and interactions of the systems we consider. This problem, however, will not be discussed in the present paper.

Postulate 5. *If there are n ($n = 1,\ 2,\ 3,\ ...$) disjointed physical systems, denoted by*

$S_1, S_2, ...S_n$, all contained in the isolated reference system I and having the possible internal states $|\phi_{S_1,j}>, ..., |\phi_{S_n,j}>$, respectively, then the joint probability that $|\phi_{S_i,j_i}>$ coincides with the internal state of S_i ($i = 1, ..n$) is given by

$$P(S_1, j_1, ..., S_n, j_n) = Tr_{S_1+...+S_n}[\hat{\pi}_{S_1,j_1}...\hat{\pi}_{S_n,j_n}\hat{\rho}_{S_1+...+S_n}(I)], \tag{9}$$

where $\hat{\pi}_{S_i,j_i} = |\phi_{S_i,j_i}><\phi_{S_i,j_i}|$.

The possible internal states $|\phi_{S_i,j}>$ (cf. the definition after **Postulate 3**) are the eigenstates of $\hat{\rho}_{S_i}(I)$. It should be emphasized that this postulate is about what exists (independent of measurement) and not about probabilities of the results of measurements (as in the conventional interpretation).

Let us mention briefly the special case $n = 1$. The probability that an eigenstate of $\hat{\rho}_S(I)$ coincides with the internal state of S is given by the corresponding eigenvalue.

Finally, let us emphasize again that the time dependent Schrödinger equation remains valid for closed systems. Note that in the present theory there is no collapse or reduction of the wave function, and every conclusion should be drawn by using the above rules.

2.3 Quantum measurements

We are now in the position to discuss the problem of quantum measurements by using the new scheme. Let us return to the spin measurement introduced at the beginning of subsection 2.1. The internal state of the system $P + M$ (particle plus measuring device) after the measurement is given by $|\Psi>$ in Eq. (6). If we want to know what the result of the measurement is, then, according to **Postulate 4** we have to determine the internal state of the measuring device, i.e., $\hat{\rho}_M(M)$. In order to do this first we calculate the state of the measuring device with respect to the whole system $P + M$, i.e., we calculate $\hat{\rho}_M(P + M)$. According to **Postulate 2** this is equal to $\mathrm{Tr}_P|\Psi><\Psi| = |m_\uparrow> |\alpha|^2 < m_\uparrow| + |m_\downarrow> |\beta|^2 < m_\downarrow|$ (cf. Eq. (7). Assuming that $P + M$ is isolated, **Postulate 3** implies that the internal state of M will be one of the eigenstates of $\hat{\rho}_M(P + M)$, i.e., either $|m_\uparrow>$ or $|m_\downarrow>$. In other terms, $\hat{\rho}_M(M)$ is either $|m_\uparrow><m_\uparrow|$ or $|m_\downarrow><m_\downarrow|$ (cf. **Postulate 1**). From the knowledge of $\hat{\rho}_M(P + M)$ we cannot predict, which of these two state will $\hat{\rho}_M(M)$ actually be. We can, however, predict

the corresponding probabilities: according to **Postulate 5** (applying it with $n = 1$) $\hat{\rho}_M(M) = |m_\uparrow >< m_\uparrow|$ with probability $|\alpha|^2$ and
$\hat{\rho}_M(M) = |m_\downarrow >< m_\downarrow|$ with probability $|\beta|^2$.

One might say that this is just the same as in traditional quantum mechanics. Yes, it is. But remember what was the price for it in traditional quantum mechanics: one had to introduce the collapse of the wave function, i.e., one had to assume that the Schrödinger equation is sometimes invalid (but it was not clearly specified, under which circumstances). The resulting confusion is well demonstrated by Schrödinger's cat paradox. In contrast, in the present interpretation the Schrödinger equation remains valid (it even describes the measurement process), and the correct result comes out when the postulates of the theory are consistently applied. It has also been shown in Ref. [15] that Schrödinger's cat paradox [17] can be solved within the present approach.

Let us consider now the situation when an observer reads the result of the measurement. The dynamics of this process is given approximately by Eq. (8). Combining it with Eq. (6) we get for the evolution of the internal state of the (by assumption isolated) $P + M + O$ system (O standing for the observer) during reading the device

$$(\alpha|\uparrow>|m_\uparrow> + \beta|\downarrow>|m_\downarrow>)\,|O_0> \\ \rightarrow \alpha|\uparrow>|m_\uparrow>|O_\uparrow> + \beta|\downarrow>|m_\downarrow>|O_\downarrow> \quad . \tag{10}$$

Applying **Postulate 2**, we get

$$\hat{\rho}_P(P + M + O) = |\uparrow> |\alpha|^2 <\uparrow| + |\downarrow> |\beta|^2 <\downarrow| \tag{11}$$

and

$$\hat{\rho}_M(P + M + O) = |m_\uparrow> |\alpha|^2 < m_\uparrow| + |m_\downarrow> |\beta|^2 < m_\downarrow| \tag{12}$$

both before and after the reading, while

$$\hat{\rho}_O(P + M + O) = |O_\uparrow> |\alpha|^2 < O_\uparrow| + |O_\downarrow> |\beta|^2 < O_\downarrow| \tag{13}$$

after the reading. Applying **Postulate 3** and **Postulate 5** (for $n = 1$) we get that $\hat{\rho}_P(P) = |\uparrow >< \uparrow|$ with probability $|\alpha|^2$ or $\hat{\rho}_P(P) = |\downarrow >< \downarrow|$ with probability $|\beta|^2$, $\hat{\rho}_M(M) = |m_\uparrow >< m_\uparrow|$ with probability $|\alpha|^2$ or $\hat{\rho}_M(M) =$

$|m_\downarrow >< m_\downarrow|$ with probability $|\beta|^2$. These are valid both before and after the reading. Similarly, we also get that after the reading $\hat{\rho}_O(O) = |O_\uparrow >< O_\uparrow|$ with probability $|\alpha|^2$ or $\hat{\rho}_O(O) = |O_\downarrow >< O_\downarrow|$ with probability $|\beta|^2$. Let us consider now the correlations between the internal states of the systems P and M. Applying **Postulate 5** for $n = 2$ we find that the probability that $\hat{\rho}_P(P) = |\uparrow >< \uparrow|$ and $\hat{\rho}_M(M) = |m_\downarrow >< m_\downarrow|$ is zero. The probability that $\hat{\rho}_P(P) = |\downarrow >< \downarrow|$ and $\hat{\rho}_M(M) = |m_\uparrow >< m_\uparrow|$ is also zero. These results hold both before and after the reading.

What does this all mean? First of all, it implies that there is a strict correlation between the internal state of the measuring device and that of the measured object. This is what makes us possible to draw conclusions about the internal state of the measured object after the measurement from the knowledge of the measurement result. Secondly, in the above description the particle P is a closed system during the reading, which means an interaction between M and O only. As has been emphasized above, for closed systems the Schrödinger equation holds. In our case this implies that the internal state of the particle does not change when reading the measuring device M. Moreover, as the correlation between the internal states of P and M is the same strict correlation both before and after the reading, it also follows that that the internal state of the measuring device does not change when reading the result. This again fits our physical expectations.

Let us consider now the correlations between the internal states of the systems P and O and between those of M and O. Applying **Postulate 5** we find again a strict correlation. E.g., if $\hat{\rho}_O(O) = |O_\downarrow >< O_\downarrow|$, then $\hat{\rho}_P(P) = |\downarrow >< \downarrow|$ and $\hat{\rho}_M(M) = |m_\downarrow >< m_\downarrow|$. Applying **Postulate 4**, we can tell that the internal state of the observer corresponds to that what he/she has read from the measuring device. The above strict correlations mean that the knowledge of the measurement result allows one to draw unambigous conclusions about the internal states of the measured object P and of the measuring device M. Also, as the internal state of M has not been changed when reading the result, one may equally well apply **Postulate 4** to M. This demonstrates that in the present theory there is no ambiguity concerning the question when the measurement is accomplished[28]. It also demonstrates that it is not necessary to calculate at each measurement situation the internal state of the observer. It suffices to consider the measuring device only, provided that it is guaranteed that the possible internal states of the measuring device will be uniquely related to those of an observer when

reading the result. The classical nature of the possible internal states of the measuring device[29] ensures this.

Note that throughout the above discussion we used a rather simplified description. The more correct treatment would have been the following. One considers the system $P + M$ together with all those systems which interact with it, so that the resulting compound system $I \supset (P + M)$ is already (to a good approximation[30]) an isolated system. Provided the internal state of this system is known before the measurement, one solves the time dependent Schrödinger equation to get the internal state of I after the measurement (remember that the term 'measurement' now means just the interaction between P and M). Once it is known, one applies **Postulate 2** to get $\hat{\rho}_M(I)$ (i.e., one calculates $\mathrm{Tr}_{I\setminus M}\hat{\rho}_I(I)$). Applying now **Postulate 3** one has to diagonalize $\hat{\rho}_M(I)$, as the internal state $\hat{\rho}_M(M)$ will be one of the eigenstates, and (due to **Postulate 5**) an eigenvalue gives the probability that the corresponding eigenstate coincides with the internal state of M. Finally, according to **Postulate 4** the internal state of M contains the result of the measurement. One can imagine this so that each eigenstate of $\hat{\rho}_M(I)$ is such that in coordinate representation it is sharply peaked at some definite pointer position and in momentum representation it is sharply peaked at zero pointer momentum. This ensures that reading or recording the measurement result with a further device will not change the result of the measurement.

Let us return now to the question of the existence of the states. It has been told above that the state $\hat{\rho}_S(R)$ of a system S with respect to the quantum reference system R ($S \subseteq R$) is an element of the reality because in principle there exist a nondisturbing measurement to it, i.e., if a suitable observable is measured on R the state $\hat{\rho}_S(R)$ does not change but will be learned with probability 1. We shall show this now. Let us consider an isolated system I which contains the system R. Consider the state $\hat{\rho}_R(I)$. This is at the same time a hermitian operator, so it can be considered as an observable acting on the Hilbert space of R. Suppose we are outside of I and construct a measuring device M (so that M and I are disjointed), whose interaction with R can be given by the relations

$$|\phi_{R,j}> |m_0> \rightarrow |\phi_{R,j}> |m_j> \tag{14}$$

where the states $|\phi_{R,j}>$ stand for the eigenstates of $\hat{\rho}_R(I)$, and the states $|m_j>$ are the (orthonormed) pointer states of the measuring device. The

initial internal state of I can be written as

$$|\Psi_I >= \sum_j c_j |\phi_{I\setminus R,j} > |\phi_{R,j} > \ . \tag{15}$$

Here $|\phi_{I\setminus R,j} >$ stand for the eigenstates of $\hat{\rho}_{I\setminus R}(I)$. Note that the expression (15) (Schmidt representation[31], see also Appendix A in Ref. [15]) is a completely general one. Due to the properties of the orthonormed states $|\phi_{R,j} >$ and $|\phi_{I\setminus R,j} >$ only a single sum occurs in (15). Combining (14) and (15), we get for the state of the system $M + I$ after the measurement[32]

$$\sum_j c_j |\phi_{I\setminus R,j} > |\phi_{R,j} > |m_j > \ . \tag{16}$$

Now we can repeat the calculation and the arguments we have had above when discussing the reading of the measuring device. Formally, the replacement of the systems is $P \to I \setminus R$, $M \to R$, and $O \to M$. The conclusion now is that the internal state of M is uniquely related to the internal state of R, and that this latter has not been changed during the measurement. Therefore, if we get the j-th result when performing the measurement, we can be sure that the internal state of R is $\hat{\rho}_R(R) = |\phi_{R,j} >< \phi_{R,j}|$, and it has been the same already before the measurement. The state $\hat{\rho}_S(R)$ itself is given by **Postulate 2**.

3 Explanation of the violation of Bell's inequality

Let us consider now a two-particle system $P_1 + P_2$ consisting of the spin-half particles P_1 and P_2. They have previously interacted with each other but then have become separated so much that there is no interaction between them any longer. The initial internal state of the two-particle system be

$$\sum_j c_j |\phi_{P_1,j} > |\phi_{P_2,j} > \tag{17}$$

where $c_1 = a$, $c_2 = -b$ (certainly $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$)[33], $|\phi_{P_1,1} >= |1, \uparrow >$, $|\phi_{P_1,2} >= |1, \downarrow >$, $|\phi_{P_2,1} >= |2, \downarrow >$, $|\phi_{P_2,2} >= |2, \uparrow >$. When the two-particle system is in the state (17), there is a strict correlation between the internal

states $\hat{\rho}_{P_1}(P_1)$
$= |\psi_{P_1} >< \psi_{P_1}|$ and $\hat{\rho}_{P_2}(P_2) = |\psi_{P_2} >< \psi_{P_2}|$. Provided that the system $P_1 + P_2$ is initially isolated, applying **Postulate 5** we obtain that the probability that $|\psi_{P_1} >= |\phi_{P_1,j} >$ and $|\psi_{P_2} >= |\phi_{P_2,k} >$ is $P(P_1, j, P_2, k) = |c_j|^2 \delta_{j,k}$.

Let us consider now a typical experimental situation, when measurements on both particles are performed. Before the measurements the internal state of the isolated system $P_1 + M_1 + P_2 + M_2$ (P_1, P_2 standing for the particles and M_1, M_2 for the measuring devices, respectively) is given by $\left(\sum_j c_j |\phi_{P_1,j} > |\phi_{P_2,j} >\right) |m_0^{(1)} > |m_0^{(2)} >$, while it is

$$\sum_j c_j \hat{U}_t(P_1 + M_1) \left(|\phi_{P_1,j} > |m_0^{(1)} >\right) \hat{U}_t(P_2 + M_2) \left(|\phi_{P_2,j} > |m_0^{(2)} >\right) \quad , (18)$$

with a time t later, i.e. during and after the measurements. Here $\hat{U}_t(P_i + M_i)$ $(i = 1, 2)$ stands for the unitary time evolution operator of the closed system $P_i + M_i$.

Eq.(18) implies (according to **Postulate 2**) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{\rho}_{P_1+M_1}(P_1 + M_1 + P_2 + M_2) \qquad (19) \\ &= \sum_j \hat{U}_t(P_1 + M_1)|\phi_{P_1,j} > |m_0^{(1)} > |c_j|^2 < m_0^{(1)}| < \phi_{P_1,j}|\hat{U}_t^+(P_1 + M_1) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{\rho}_{P_2+M_2}(P_1 + M_1 + P_2 + M_2) \qquad (20) \\ &= \sum_j \hat{U}_t(P_2 + M_2)|\phi_{P_2,j} > |m_0^{(2)} > |c_j|^2 < m_0^{(2)}| < \phi_{P_2,j}|\hat{U}_t^+(P_2 + M_2) \,. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have made used the unitarity of the operators $\hat{U}_t(P_i + M_i)$ when calculating the traces. According to **Postulate 3** the internal state of the $P_1 + M_1$ is one of the states $\hat{U}_t(P_1 + M_1)|\phi_{P_1,j} > |m_0^{(1)} >$ and that of $P_2 + M_2$ is one of the states $\hat{U}_t(P_2 + M_2)|\phi_{P_2,j} > |m_0^{(2)} >$, the corresponding probabilities being in both cases (according to **Postulate 5**) $|c_j|^2$. One can see here explicitly that the possible internal states of $P_1 + M_1$ are independent of the interaction between P_2 and M_2, and vice versa. As the systems $P_1 + M_1$ and $P_2 + M_2$ are closed systems, their internal states evolve unitarily which also means that if initially (at time $t = 0$) the internal state of $P_1 + M_1$ was $|\phi_{P_1,1} > |m_0^{(1)} >$, then at a later time t it is $\hat{U}_t(P_1 + M_1)|\phi_{P_1,1} > |m_0^{(1)} >$.

Hence we see that according to the present theory the two measurement processes, i.e., the time evolution of the internal state of $P_1 + M_1$ and of $P_2 + M_2$, do not influence each other. This means that there is no mysterious action-at-a-distance, and the principle of locality is satisfied. But why is then Bell's inequality violated? This will be explained below. Before doing that, it is of worth addressing here briefly one more question. One may ask what is then the state of $P_1 + M_1$ one gets if one applies the traditional concept of the collapse of the wave function to the second measurement process. That state *does* depend on the type and result of the second measurement. It turns out that it can be identified with $\hat{\rho}_{P_1+M_1}(P_1 + M_1 + P_2)$ in the present scheme (remember that the internal state is $\hat{\rho}_{P_1+M_1}(P_1 + M_1)$). It can be understood why the state $\hat{\rho}_{P_1+M_1}(P_1 + M_1 + P_2)$ depends on the second measurement. It is not because of some action-at-a-distance between $P_1 + M_1$ and $P_2 + M_2$, but it is due to the change of the internal state of the quantum reference system $P_1 + M_1 + P_2$. This change is indeed due to the second measurement process, but takes place locally, as the second particle which interacts with M_2 is a subsystem of $P_1 + M_1 + P_2$. This is actually the resolution of the EPR paradox within the framework of the present approach[15].

The time evolution of the internal state of $P_i + M_i$ can be given more explicitly if we specify the dynamics of the measurements by the relations

$$|\xi(P_i, j) > |m_0^{(i)} > \rightarrow \ |\xi(P_i, j) > |m_j^{(i)} > \quad , \tag{21}$$

where $i, j = 1, 2$, $|\xi(P_1, j) >$ is the j-th eigenstate of the spin component $\vec{S} \cdot \vec{a}$ measured on the first particle and $|\xi(P_2, j) >$ is the j-th eigenstate of the spin component $\vec{S} \cdot \vec{b}$ measured on the second particle (cf. the notations in the Introduction). Using Eq.(21) the time evolution of the internal state of the closed systems $P_i + M_i$ is given explicitly by

$$|\psi_{P_i} > |m_0^{(i)} > \rightarrow \ \sum_j < \xi(P_i, j)|\psi_{P_i} > |\xi(P_i, j) > |m_j^{(i)} > \ . \tag{22}$$

One can see again that the i-th measurement process is completely determined by the initial internal state of the particle P_i. Therefore, any correlation between the measurements may only stem from the initial correlation of the internal states of the particles.

Let us calculate now the internal state $\hat{\rho}_{M_1}(M_1)$ which corresponds to the measured value a (cf. **Postulate 4**). Using Eq.(21) the final internal state

(18) of the whole isolated system $P_1 + P_2 + M_1 + M_2$ may be written as

$$\sum_{j,k} \left(\sum_l c_l < \xi(P_1, j)|\phi_{P_1,l} >< \xi(P_2, k)|\phi_{P_2,l} > \right)$$
$$\times |\xi(P_1, j) > |\xi(P_2, k) > |m_j^{(1)} > |m_k^{(2)} > \ . \tag{23}$$

According to **Postulate 2** $\hat{\rho}_{M_1}(P_1 + P_2 + M_1 + M_2)$ can be expressed as

$$\hat{\rho}_{M_1}(P_1 + P_2 + M_1 + M_2)$$
$$= \sum_j \left(\sum_l |c_l|^2 | < \xi(P_1, j)|\phi_{P_1,l} > |^2 \right) |m_j^{(1)} >< m_j^{(1)}| \, . \tag{24}$$

Note that it is independent of the second measurement. According to **Postulate 3** the internal state of M_1 is one of the $|m_j^{(1)} >$-s. The probability to observe the j-th result (up or down spin in the direction $\vec{a}$) is (according to **Postulate 5**)

$$P(M_1, j) = \sum_l |c_l|^2 | < \xi(P_1, j)|\phi_{P_1,l} > |^2 \, . \tag{25}$$

This may be interpreted as one intuitively expects: $|c_l|^2$ is the probability that the initial internal state $|\psi_{P_1} >$ is just $|\phi_{P_1,l} >$ (cf. **Postulate 5**), and $| < \xi(P_1, j)|\phi_{P_1,l} > |^2$ is the conditional probability that one gets the j-th result if $|\psi_{P_1} >= |\phi_{P_1,l} >$.

Let us show that the latter statement also follows from our postulates. Applying **Postulate 5** with $n = 2$ we get that the internal states of P_1 and P_2 are uniquely related before the measurements. Moreover, the initial internal state of P_2 uniquely determines the final internal state of the system $P_2 + M_2$ (this follows in a completely analogous way as in case of the first measurement process discussed above). Hence, the internal state of the system $P_2 + M_2$ after the measurements is still uniquely related to the initial internal state of P_1. Therefore, the joint probability that initially the internal state of P_1 coincides with $|\phi_{P_1,l} >$ and the result of the first measurement (represented by the internal state of M_1, cf. **Postulate 4**) corresponds to $|m_j^{(1)} >$ is the same as the joint probability that after the measurement the internal state of $P_2 + M_2$ coindides with its l-th possible internal state

$$\sum_k < \xi(P_2, k)|\phi_{P_2,l} > |\xi(P_2, k) > |m_k^{(2)} >$$

(cf. Eq. (22)) and the internal state of M_1 coindides with its j-th possible internal state $|m_j^{(1)}>$. In case of this latter probability the systems involved, i.e. M_1 and $P_2 + M_2$ are disjointed, thus we may apply **Postulate 5** to get the expression $|c_l|^2| < \xi(P_1, j)|\phi_{P_1,l} > |^2$ which already implies the above interpretation of the factors.

Certainly the first and the second measurement play a symmetric role. Thus we have shown that the initial internal state of P_1 (P_2) determines the outcome of the first (second) measurement in the usual probabilistic sense.

But doesn't it mean that the internal states of P_1 and P_2 are local hidden variables? They indeed play the role of λ (cf. the Introduction). Nevertheless, there is a fundamental difference. Hidden variables are thought to be comparable with the results of the measurements so that their joint probability $P(a, b, \lambda)$ can be defined (cf. assumption (*) in the Introduction). In contrast, we show below that in the present theory there is no way to define the analogous joint probability $P(P_1, l_1, P_2, l_2, (0); M_1, j, M_2, k, (t))$, i.e., the probability that initially the internal state of P_1 is $|\phi_{P_1,l_1} >$ and that of P_2 is $|\phi_{P_2,l_2} >$ *and* finally the internal state of M_1 is $|m_j^{(1)} >$ and that of M_2 is $|m_k^{(2)} >$. Intuitively we would write

$$\begin{aligned} &P(P_1, l_1, P_2, l_2, (0); M_1, j, M_2, k, (t)) \\ &= |c_{l_1}|^2 \delta_{l_1,l_2}| < \xi(P_1, j)|\phi_{P_1,l_1} > |^2 \; < \xi(P_2, k)|\phi_{P_2,l_2} > |^2, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

as $|c_{l_1}|^2 \delta_{l_1,l_2}$ is the joint probability that $|\psi_{P_1} >= |\phi_{P_1,l} >$ [34] and $|\psi_{P_2} >= |\phi_{P_2,l} >$, and $| < \xi(P_i, j)|\phi_{P_i,l_i} > |^2$ is the conditional probability that one gets the j-th result in the i-th measurement if initially $|\psi_{P_i} >= |\phi_{P_i,l_i} > (i = 1, 2)$. Certainly the existence of such a joint probability would immediately imply the validity of Bell's inequality, thus it is absolutely important to understand why this probability does not exist.

Let us mention, first of all, that using **Postulate 5** for $n = 2$, we may calculate the correlation between the measurements, i.e., the joint probability that $|\psi_{M_1} >= |m_j^{(1)} >$ *and* $|\psi_{M_2} >= |m_k^{(2)} >$. We obtain

$$P(M_1, j, M_2, k) = \left| \sum_l c_l < \xi(P_1, j)|\phi_{P_1,l} >< \xi(P_2, k)|\phi_{P_2,l} > \right|^2 . \tag{27}$$

This is the usual quantum mechanical expression which violates Bell's inequality and whose correctness is experimentally proven. Thus our theory

gives the correct expression for the correlation. Nevertheless, if the joint probability (26) exists, it leads to

$$P(M_1, j, M_2, k) = \sum_l |c_l|^2 | < \xi(P_1, j)|\phi_{P_1,l} > |^2 | < \xi(P_2, k)|\phi_{P_2,l} > |^2 \quad (28)$$

which satisfies Bell's inequality and contradicts Eq.(27). Let us demonstrate that no such contradiction appears.

If we try to find an expression for the joint probability $P(P_1, l_1, P_2, l_2, (0); M_1, j, M_2, k, (t))$ by using our Postulates, the first difficuly is that the occuring internal states are given at different times, while **Postulate 5** (which gives the joint probabilities in the present theory) refers only to equal time correlations. Nevertheless, we can use the fact that the initial internal state of P_1 (P_2) is uniquely related to the final internal state of $P_1 + M_1$ ($P_2 + M_2$). Therefore, if $P(P_1, l_1, P_2, l_2, (0); M_1, j, M_2, k, (t))$ exists, then it must be equal to $P(P_1 + M_1, l_1, P_2 + M_2, l_2, M_1, j, M_2, k)$. In this latter joint probability all the possible internal states are given at the final time (i.e., after the measurements). But still we cannot apply **Postulate 5**, as the systems that occur here are not disjointed. We may tell that the internal state of $P_1 + M_1$ and that of $P_2 + M_2$ are uniquely related, so it is enough to consider the joint probability $P(P_1 + M_1, l, M_1, j, M_2, k)$. But even here the systems $P_1 + M_1$ and M_1 are not disjointed. If we still try to apply Eq. (9), the result will depend on the ordering of the projectors $\hat{\pi}_{P_1+M_1,l} = |\phi_{P_1+M_1,l} >< \phi_{P_1+M_1,l}|$ and $\hat{\pi}_{M_1,j} = |\phi_{M_1,j} >< \phi_{M_1,j}|$. We get either[35]

$$\begin{aligned} &P(P_1 + M_1, l, M_1, j, M_2, k) \\ &= Tr_{P_1+M_1+M_2}[\hat{\pi}_{P_1+M_1,l}\hat{\pi}_{M_1,j}\hat{\pi}_{M_2,k}\hat{\rho}_{P_1+M_1+M_2}(P_1 + P_2 + M_1 + M_2)] \\ &= c_l^* < \phi_{P_1,l}|\xi(P_1, j) >< \phi_{P_2,l}|\xi(P_2, k) > \sum_n c_n < \xi(P_1, j)|\phi_{P_1,n} >< \xi(P_2, k)|\phi_{P_2,n} > \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} &P(P_1 + M_1, l, M_1, j, M_2, k) \\ &= Tr_{P_1+M_1+M_2}[\hat{\pi}_{M_1,j}\hat{\pi}_{P_1+M_1,l}\hat{\pi}_{M_2,k}\hat{\rho}_{P_1+M_1+M_2}(P_1 + P_2 + M_1 + M_2)] \\ &= c_l < \xi(P_1, j)|\phi_{P_1,l} >< \xi(P_2, k)|\phi_{P_2,l} > \sum_n c_n^* < \phi_{P_1,n}|\xi(P_1, j) >< \phi_{P_2,n}|\xi(P_2, k) > . \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

These expressions are usually not even real[36] so one cannot interpret them as probabilities. Therefore, the joint probability $P(P_1, l_1, P_2, l_2, (0); M_1, j, M_2, k, (t))$ cannot be defined within the framework of the present theory.

One can arrive at the same conclusion in another, rather instructive way. Instead of trying to find a suitable formal expression, one may try to define

the joint probability in question in terms of suitable measurements. Measurements should of course be treated as in Section 3., i.e., they are interactions between physical systems and obey the postulates of the theory.

Using the method proposed above, we shall always get real, nonnegative expressions for the probabilities, as we shall consider correlations among the disjointed measuring devices. Let us determine the initial internal state of P_1 by a suitable nondisturbing measurement, so that we can compare the result with those of the other two measurements later. The dynamics of the nondisturbing measurement is given by

$$|\phi_{P_1,l}> |m_0^{(3)}> \rightarrow |\phi_{P_1,l}> |m_l^{(3)}> \ . \tag{31}$$

Here the states $|m_0^{(3)}>$, $|m_l^{(3)}>$ are states of the extra measuring device M_3. Therefore, the internal state of the system $P_1 + P_2 + M_1 + M_2 + M_3$ after the extra, nondisturbing measurement, but before the other two original measurements is given by

$$\left(\sum_l c_l |\phi_{P_1,l}> |\phi_{P_2,l}> |m_l^{(3)}>\right) |m_0^{(1)}> |m_0^{(2)}> \ . \tag{32}$$

One can show (cf. the discussion at the end of Section 3.) that the internal state of P_1 has not changed, but the internal state of the measuring device M_3 is uniquely related to it (and to the internal state of P_2 as well). Using Eq. (21) one obtains for the final internal state of the system $P_1 + P_2 + M_1 + M_2 + M_3$ the expression

$$\sum_l c_l \left(\sum_j < \xi(P_1,j)|\phi_{P_1,l}> |\xi(P_1,j)> |m_j^{(1)}>\right) \\ \times \left(\sum_k < \xi(P_2,k)|\phi_{P_2,l}> |\xi(P_2,k)> |m_k^{(2)}>\right) |m_l^{(3)}> \ . \tag{33}$$

As the systems $M_1,\ M_2,\ M_3$ are disjointed, we may apply **Postulate 5** for $n = 3$ and we indeed get for $P(M_3, l, M_1, j, M_2, k)$ the expression (26) (for $l_1 = l_2 = l$). Do we get then a contradiction with Eq.(27)? No, because applying **Postulate 5** directly for $n = 2$, we get in this case Eq.(28) instead of Eq.(27). Thus we see that the extra measurement has changed the correlations and our theory gives account of this effect consistently. So the

situation is that if we do not perform the extra measurement with M_3, then the joint probability $P(P_1, l_1, P_2, l_2, (0); M_1, j, M_2, k, (t))$ cannot be defined, therefore the assumption (*) made at the derivation of Bell's inequality fails and the correlation (27) violates Bell's inequality. If, however, we do the extra measurement, $P(P_1, l_1, P_2, l_2, (0); M_1, j, M_2, k, (t))$ can be defined via $P(M_3, l, M_1, j, M_2, k)$, but the extra measurement changes the correlations $P(M_1, j, M_2, k)$, so that they indeed satisfy Bell's inequality.

Summing up, we have seen that the initial internal state of P_1 (P_2) determines the first (second) measurement process. As the measurement processes do not influence each other, the observed correlations may stem only from the 'common past' of the particles. The internal state of P_1 and that of P_2 'carry' the initial correlations and 'transfer' them to the measuring devices. In this sense the internal state of P_1 (or that of P_2) plays the role of the hidden parameter λ. This state, however, is not hidden at all, as it can be determined via a suitable measurement with unit probability, without disturbing this state itself. Another difference is that in the absence of such a measurement, the initial internal state of P_1 is not comparable with the results of the measurements done by M_1 and M_2, so that a joint probability to these states cannot be assigned.

This means that the reason for the violation of Bell's inequality is that the usual derivations always assume that those quantities (hidden parameters) which carry the initial correlations can be freely compared with the results of the measurements. This comparability is usually thought to be a consequence of realism. According to the present theory, the above assumption goes beyond the requirements of realism and proves to be wrong, as e.g. the internal states $|\psi_{P_1+M_1}>$, $|\psi_{M_1}>$ and $|\psi_{M_2}>$ do exist individually, but they cannot be compared without changing the correlations.

On the other hand, any attempt to compare the initial internal states of P_1 and P_2 with the results of both measurements changes the correlations, so that they satisfy Bell's inequality. The present theory gives account of this effect consistently.

4 Conclusion

A new interpretation of quantum mechanics has been discussed. It has been demonstrated that the consistent use of its postulates leads to a physically

acceptable description of the quantum measurements.

Most importantly, the EPR-Bell experiment has been analyzed within the framework of the new approach. The main conclusion is that Bell's theorem (which states that no local realistic theory can reproduce all the statistical correlations of quantum mechanical two-body systems) is *not valid*. Quantum mechanics *is* a local realistic theory. The violation of Bell's inequality is due to the fact that certain states, although exist, cannot be compared without changing the experimental correlations and therefore a corresponding joint probability cannot be defined.

Note that there are other proofs of Bell's theorem which do not use Bell's inequality (or any other kind of inequality)[37]. Nevertheless, these proofs also assume that existing quantities (including the 'hidden parameters', whose role is played by some quantum states within the present approach) can always be compared, an assumption which usually does not hold true according to the present theory. It can in fact be shown that these proofs are not correct from the point of view of the new theory. The details of this, however, will be published elsewhere.

Finally, let me comment briefly the relation of the present interpretation to the previous ones. There is an enormous number of different attempts, and there are quite a few which are based on the assumption of the universal validity of the Schrödinger equation [38], [39], [40]. Some even utilize the Schmidt decomposition, which is strongly related to Postulate 3.[40] The present interpretation possesses these features, too. Nevertheless, it has some essentially new features as well. These are the following:

1. the concept of the quantum reference systems,

2. the assumption that the dependence of quantum states on quantum reference systems is a fundamental property of quantum mechanics,

3. the consistent formulation of the rules of the theory,

4. the present interpretation implies that quantum mechanics is a local realistic theory.

It should be noted that two previous interpretations have introduced some rather similar (but not equivalent) concept as the the dependence of quantum states on quantum reference systems here. In Ref. [38] states of a system are

defined with respect to *the states of the complementer subsystem.* In Ref. [38] states of a system are defined with respect to *the complementer subsystems (observers).* In contrast, in the present interpretation states of a system are defined with respect to the *quantum reference system, which contains the system to be described.* Note that the above interpretations, contrary to the present one, do not explain the violation of Bell's inequality by maintaining realism and the principle of locality.

Acknowledgements

The author is indebted to A.Bringer, G.Eilenberger, M.Eisele, T.Geszti, R.Graham, G.Györgyi, F.Haake, Z.Kaufmann, H.Lustfeld, P.Rosenqvist, Y.Shih, P.Szépfalusy, T.Tasnádi and G.Vattay for useful discussions, to P.Szépfalusy also for his continued interest in the work and for encouragement, and to N.D.Mermin for several valuable remarks and advices.

The author wants to thank for the hospitality of the *Institut für Festkörperphysik, Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH* where a substantial part of the work has been done. The present paper came into being within the framework of a scientific and technological cooperation agreement between the Hungarian and the German government as a result of a research cooperation supported by the OMFB (Hungary) and the BMFT (Germany). This work has been partially supported by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences under Grant Nos. OTKA T 017493, OTKA F 17166 and OTKA F 19266.

References

[1] Of course, they speak about "nonlocality" instead of "telepathy". Nonetheless, they accept the idea of an action-at-a-distance, at least 'at the level of hidden variables'.

[2] A.Einstein, in: *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, ed. P.A.Schilpp, (Tudor Publishing Company, New York, 1951), 2nd ed., p. 683.

[3] J.S.Bell, "On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Paradox," Physics **1** 195-200 (1964).

[4] S.J.Freedman, J.F.Clauser, "Experimental Test of Local Hidden-Variable Theories," Phys.Rev.Lett. **28** 938-941 (1972).

[5] A.Aspect, P.Grangier, and G.Roger, "Experimental Realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm *Gedankenexperiment*: A New Violation of Bell's Inequalities," Phys.Rev.Lett. **49** 91-94 (1982).

[6] A.Aspect, J.Dalibard, and G.Roger, "Experimental Test of Bell's Inequalities Using Time-Varying Analyzers," Phys.Rev.Lett. **49** 1804-1807 (1982).

[7] P.R.Tapster, J.G.Rarity, and P.C.M.Owens, "Violation of Bell's Inequality over 4 km of Optical Fiber," Phys. Rev. Lett. **73** 1923-1926 (1994).

[8] L.R.Kasday, J.D.Ullman, and C.S.Wu, "Angular Correlation of Compton-Scattered Annihilation Photons and Hidden Variables," Nuovo Cimento **25** B (2), 633-661 (1975).

[9] M.Lamehi-Rachti, and W.Mittig, "Quantum mechanics and hidden variables: A test of Bell's inequality by the measurement of the spin correlation in low-energy proton-proton scattering," Phys.Rev. D **14** (10), 2543-2555 (1976).

[10] Clear and rigorous derivations of Bell's inequality can be found in: J.S.Bell, "On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Paradox," Physics **1** 195-200 (1964), J.F.Clauser, and M.A.Horne, "Experimental consequences of objective local theories," Phys.Rev. D **10** (2), 526-535 (1974), J.F.Clauser, and A.Shimony, "Bell's theorem: experimental tests and implications," Rep.Prog.Phys. **41**, 1881-1927 (1978), B. d'Espagnat, "Nonseparability and the tentative descriptions of reality," Phys.Rep. **110** (4) 201-264 (1984).

[11] J.F.Clauser, M.A.Horne, A.Shimony, and R.A.Holt, "Proposed Experiment to Test Local Hidden-Variable Theories," Phys.Rev.Lett. **23** 880-884 (1969).

[12] Note that Bell derived his inequality for the expectation value of the product of the spins, i.e., for $E(\vec{a},\vec{b}) = P(\vec{a}+,\vec{b}+) - P(\vec{a}+,\vec{b}-) - P(\vec{a}-,\vec{b}+) + P(\vec{a}-,\vec{b}-) = 4P(\vec{a}+,\vec{b}+) - 2P_1(\vec{a}+) - 2P_2(\vec{b}+) + 1 = 4P(\vec{a}+,\vec{b}+) - 1$. Eq.(4) readily implies

$$1 + E(\vec{a},\vec{b}) \geq \left| E(\vec{a},\vec{c}) - E(\vec{b},\vec{c}) \right| \ ,$$

which is the original form of Bell's inequality.

[13] Note that in this experiment photons were used, therefore Eq.(5), which refers to spin-half particles, does not apply.

[14] B. d'Espagnat, "The Quantum Theory and Reality," Sci.Am. **241**(5) 128-140 (1979), B. d'Espagnat, "Are There Realistically Interpretable Local Theories?," J.Stat.Phys. **56** 747-766 (1989).

[15] Gy.Bene, "Quantum reference systems: a new framework for quantum mechanics," 1997, to appear in the Physica **A**, see also at the web site http://xxx.lanl.gov/quant-ph/abs/9703021

One might perhaps tell that it is not a new theory, just a new interpretation of quantum mechanics. Schrödinger's equation is not changed, but von Neumann's postulate concerning the measurement process is replaced by a completely new scheme which does not imply the collapse of the wave function.

[16] J.von Neumann, *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik* (Springer, Berlin, 1932).

[17] E.Schrödinger, "Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik," Naturwissenschaften **23** 807-812, 823-828, 844-849 (1935).

[18] A.Einstein, B.Podolsky, and N.Rosen, "Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?," Phys.Rev. **47** 777-780 (1935).

[19] This is due to the absence of a distinguished inertia system and the finiteness of the velocity of light in vacuum.

[20] L.D.Landau and E.M.Lifshitz *Quantum mechanics [Course on theoretical physics, Vol.3]* (Pergamon Press, New York, 1965), 2nd ed., pp.21-24.

[21] N.D.Mermin, "The Ithaca Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics," notes for a lecture given at the Golden Jubileee Workshop on Foundations of Quantum Theory, Tata Institute, Bombay, September 9-12, 1996, see also at the web site http://xxx.lanl.gov/quant-ph/abs/9609013

[22] Until the rules of the new theory are set, we have to use the traditional framework.

[23] We define an isolated system as such a system which has not been interacting with the outside world. In contrast, a closed system is such a system that is not interacting with any other system at the given instant of time (but might have interacted in the past).

[24] As $\hat{\rho}_R(I)$ is a hermitian operator, formally it can be conceived as an observable as well.

[25] The eigenstates corresponding to zero eigenvalues occur with zero probability, cf. **Postulate 5**.

[26] This nonphysical case is, however, rather favoured in *Gedankenexperiments*.

[27] After all, experience is human experience.

[28] As is known, in traditional quantum mechanics there is no clear answer to this question. One may tell, the measurement is accomplished when the interaction between the measuring device and the measured object has happened. But one may tell equally well that it is accomplished only if the result has been read by an observer or even if we ourselves asked this observer about the result. In contrast, in the new approach the measurement is unambigously accomplished when the interaction between the measuring device and the measured object has happened.

[29] I.e., small standard deviations for the coordinates and momenta.

[30] 'Good approximation' means here that a further enlagement of the compound system does not lead to a significant difference in the results of the procedure described below.

[31] E.Schmidt, "Zur Theorie der linearen und nichtlinearen Integralgleichungen," Math. Annalen. **63** 433-476 (1907), O.Kübler and H.D.Zeh, "Dynamics of Quantum Correlations," Ann.Phys. (NY) **76** 405-418 (1973), A.Albrecht, "Following a 'collapsing' wave function," Phys.Rev. **D 48** 3768-3778 (1993).

[32] Here we tacitly assume that M is an isolated system as well. Strictly speaking, we should have included in M all the systems which interacted with it before the measurement (even ourselves, as we have interacted with it during its construction) to have an actually isolated system. One can convince himself/herself, however, that such a more careful description would give the same result.

[33] We assume that $|a|$ and $|b|$ are not exactly equal, as it leads to the nonphysical degeneracy mentioned after Postulate 3.

[34] Here and hereafter $|\psi_S >$ stands for the internal state of a physical system S, i.e., $\hat{\rho}_S(S) = |\psi_S >< \psi_S|$ (cf. **Postulate 1**).

[35] There are only two different cases. This is due to the possibility of a cyclic rearrangements of the operators under the trace and also because $\hat{\pi}_{M_2,k}$ commutes with the other two projectors.

[36] This is the formal reason why one has to consider disjointed systems when defining joint probabilities. If the systems are disjointed, expression (9) is real and nonnegative. If the systems are not disjointed, even reality cannot be satisfied. Note that Eq. (30) is just the complex conjugate of Eq. (29). It is interesting to see that summing over l (which corresponds to integrating over λ, cf. the Introduction) leads to the correct correlation (27) in both cases.

[37] N.D.Mermin, "Quantum mysteries revisited," Am.J.Phys. **58** (8) 731-734 (1990), D.M.Greenberger, M.A.Horne, A.Shimony, and A.Zeilinger, "Bell's theorem without inequalities," Am.J.Phys. **58** (12) 1131-1143 (1990), L.Hardy, "Quantum Mechanics, Local Realistic Theories, and

Lorentz-Invariant Realistic Theories," Phys.Rev.Lett. **68** 2981-2984 (1992), L.Hardy, "Nonlocality for Two Particles without Inequalities for Almost All Entangled States," Phys.Rev.Lett. **71**, 1665-1668 (1993).

[38] H.Everett, "'Relative State' Formulation of Quantum Mechanics," Rev.Mod.Phys. **29** 454-462 (1957).

[39] C.Rovelli, "Relational Quantum Mechanics," Int.J.Theor.Phys. **35** 1637-1651 (1996).

[40] E.Joos and H.D.Zeh, "The Emergence of Classical Properties Through Interaction with the Environment," Z.Phys. B **59** 223-243 (1985), S.Kochen, "A new interpretation of quantum mechanics," in: *Symposium on the Foundations of Modern Physics*, ed. P.Lahti and P.Mittelstaedt (World Scientific, Singapore, 1985), 1st ed., pp. 151-170, D.Dieks, "On some alleged difficulties in interpretation of quantum mechanics," Synthese **86** 77-86 (1991), R.Healy, The Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1989) 1st ed., B.Van Fraassen, Quantum Mechanics: An Empiricist View (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1991) 1st ed.